



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

WU
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/486,971	05/19/2000	VELI-MATTI LEHTOLA	933-154PCT	7050
2292	7590	10/06/2004	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			GOLLAMUDI, SHARMILA S	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			1616	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/486,971	LEHTOLA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sharmila S. Gollamudi	1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,11 and 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1, 3-4, 6, 11, 14-26 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of Request for Reconsideration received May 21, 2004 is acknowledged. Claims **1, 3-4, 6, 11, 14-26** are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

The rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 6, 11, 14-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Posti et al (US 5525354) in further view of Sherwood (WO 96/21429) and Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences is maintained.

See the Office Action of January 26, 2004 for the substance of the rejection.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/21/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the new limitation excludes an enteric coating or film coating, thus overcoming Posti et al. Applicant argues that Posti specifically desires an enteric coating, thus there is not motivation to exclude one.

The examiner points out that the inclusion or exclusion of enteric coatings is *prima facie* obvious since the selection of the coating depends on the desired release profile. WO 96/21429 teaches that a hydrophobic coating may be included if one desired a controlled release formulation wherein the medicament releases in 12 or 24 hours. See page 26. Therefore, it is clear that the inclusion or exclusion of a coating is *prima facie* obvious to a skilled artisan in the art.

Applicant argues that the uncoated tablet the examiner points to, is used as a comparative to show that the enteric coated tablet provides better bioavailability. Applicant argues that the comparative example does not contain microcrystalline cellulose.

Firstly, the examiner points to column 3 wherein Posti specifically states that the enteric coated tablet containing the instantly claimed clodronate is compared to the same tablet that is uncoated. The applicant is incorrect in his assertion that the comparative tablet does not contain microcrystalline cellulose. In fact, Posti emphasizes that the comparative clodronate tablet is identical in composition to the inventive enteric coated. On column 3, lines 60-65.

Secondly, the examiner does note that Posti states that an enteric coating provides improved bioavailability, however nonetheless an uncoated tablet is disclosed. The examiner points out that patent are relevant as prior art for all they contain. Furthermore, a known composition does not become patentable because it is has been described as somewhat inferior to some other product. See *In re Gurley*, 27 F.3d 551, 554, 31 USPQ2d 1130, 1130 (Fed. Cir.

1994). Therefore, although the uncoated clodronate tablet is considered inferior, it still constitutes prior art.

Applicant argues that the intermediate uncoated tablet before being coated, cannot be relied as prior art since one would not be motivated to use an intermediate product.

The arguments are confusing. The examiner points to the comparative uncoated tablet and not an intermediate product. However, for arguendo sake the examiner points out that a skilled artisan would have been motivated use the uncoated tablet if one desired a different release profile.

Conclusion

None of the claims are allowed at this time.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharmila S. Gollamudi whose telephone number is 571-272-0614. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30), alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on 571-272-0887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sharmila S. Gollamudi
Examiner
Art Unit 1616

SSG

Gary d. Kunz
GARY KUNZ
SUPERVISING PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600